

Attachment H: Report Discrepancy Log

7/31/2018

ID	Impacted Area:	Category	Description of Discrepancy:	Source Data							Reported By	Evaluation		
				Exhibit A (Voter #s / PCT)	Exhibit B (Payroll)	Exhibit C (Polling Location)	Ad Hoc Report: (Lake County Revised Split Report 11/1/2017)	Consolidation Report	Graphic 1	Graphic 2			GIS mapping file 10/26/2017	
1	CL -10	Exhibit A: Missing Precinct Data	CL-10 is not listed in Exhibit A but is a precinct referenced within the consolidation report	CL-10 is missing		CL-10 is included	CL-10 is missing	CL-10 is included				CL-10 is included	BT	CL-10 was not included in the ad hoc report since there are 0 active voters. The ad hoc report was used to create the Lake County precinct consolidation report referenced in Exhibit A.
2	LS-5A	Exhibit A: Missing Precinct Data	LS-5A is missing in Exhibit A	LS-5a is missing			LS-5a is included	LS-5a is included					BT	LS-5A has 201 active voters, confirmed by Lake County.
3	LS-8A	Exhibit A: Missing Precinct Data	LS-8A is missing in Exhibit A	LS-8a is missing			LS-8a is included	LS-8a is included					BT	LS-8A has 9 active voters, confirmed by Lake County.
4	LS-12	Exhibit B: Missing Payroll Data	LS-12 is missing in Exhibit B	LS-12 is included	LS-12 is missing		LS-12 is included	LS-12 is included					BT	Lake County is not using actual payroll as a cost. They are using \$690 avg cost of payroll + rent.
5	CCT	Graphic 1	Graphic 1 lists CCT as Center Town and Graphic 2 lists CCT as Cedar Creek Twn						CCT listed as Center Town	CCT listed of Cedar Creek Twn			BT	Graphic 1 should be corrected to Cedar Creek Twn, as shown in Graphic 2.
6	G3-09, G3-10, G3-11, EC-10, and EC-11	Consolidation Report	On pg. 6 of the consolidation report, there are some EC precincts that appear to be merging with Gary. For example, EC-11 merging with G3-09 and EC-10 and EC-10 merging with G3-11. This is the only instance of cross town/city precinct consolidations referenced within the report. Based on the voter data, the report should reference G3-09 to be merged with G3-10 and G3-11 (instead of EC-11). Validation Approach: - No EC precincts are included in Gary in other documentation. - There is no EC-10 referenced as a precinct in Exhibits A, B, C.	G3-11 (474 active voters) G3-9 (458 active voters) G3-10 (261 active voters) Total - 1193 active voters					G3-09 merging with G3-10 and EC-11 G3-10 merging with G3-09 and EC-11 G3-11 merging with G3-09 and EC-10 Total - 1193 active voters (but EC-11, G3-10,					
7	CCT-3 and CCT-5	Consolidation Report	On pg. 6 of the consolidation report, CCT-3 and CC-4 is listed and should include CCT-3 (542 active voters) and CCT-5 (704 voters) and the active voter total should be 1246. (Incorrect Precinct & Total of Active Voters)				CCT-3 (542) + CCT-5 (704) is included	CCT-3 (542) + CCT-5 (562) is included					BT	On pg. 6 of the consolidation report, CCT-3 and CC-4 is listed and should include CCT-3 (542 active voters) and CCT-5 (704 voters) and the active voter total should be 1246.
8	EC-23 through EC-30	Exhibit B: Missing Payroll Data	EC-23-30 is missing in Exhibit B		EC-23-30 is missing			EC-23-30 is included					BT	Received payroll in follow up from Lake County.
9	G2-05 through G2-15	Exhibit B: Missing Payroll Data	G2-05-G2-15 is missing in Exhibit B		G2-05-G2-15 is missing			G2-05-G2-15 is included					BT	Received payroll in follow up from Lake County.
10	M-01 through M-10	Exhibit B: Missing Payroll Data	M-01-M-10 is missing in Exhibit B		M-01-M-10 is missing			M-01-M-10 is included					BT	Received payroll in follow up from Lake County.
11	Griffith	Graphic 1 and Graphic 2: Calculation Variation	The new AVG Precinct (11/1/2017) size under 1411 of active voters in Graphic 1 and Graphic 2, differ when comparing the AVG Precinct size from the 11/1/2017 ad hoc report.				711		750	750			BT	The average calculation is off by 39.
12	Hanover Township	Graphic 1 and Graphic 2: Calculation Variation	The new AVG Precinct (11/1/2017) size under 1411 of active voters in Graphic 1 and Graphic 2, differ when comparing the AVG Precinct size from the 11/1/2017 ad hoc report.				996		993	993			BT	The average calculation is off by 3.
13	Hobart	Graphic 1 and Graphic 2: Calculation Variation	The new AVG Precinct (11/1/2017) size under 1411 of active voters in Graphic 1 and Graphic 2, differ when comparing the AVG Precinct size from the 11/1/2017 ad hoc report.				880		861	861			BT	The average calculation is off by 19.
14	St John Township	Graphic 1 and Graphic 2: Calculation Variation	The new AVG Precinct (11/1/2017) size under 1411 of active voters in Graphic 1 and Graphic 2, differ when comparing the AVG Precinct size from the 11/1/2017 ad hoc report.				834		843	843			BT	The average calculation is off by 9.
15	ST JOHN PRECINCT 18	Clarification	Omitted from the consolidation report but conflicts with Lake County's reasoning since there are less than 600 active voters and should have been included in the consolidation report. Additionally, the # in column N is the # of active voters which should be listed.	Do not have this as a precinct listed	Do not have this as a precinct listed						Included		39dn	Does St. John Precinct 18 exist?
16	HO-18	Consolidation Report	The consolidation report (pg516-517) incorrectly lists 1217 active total voters. The data in Exhibit A totals 1197 active voters.	HO-18 sum total 1197 active voters			HO-18 (547) and HO-04 (650)						BT	
17	MER 30 and MER 31	Consolidation Report	The consolidation report incorrectly lists both MER 30 and MER 31 as having 806 active voters and should be corrected to show MER-30 (417) and MER-31 (389)	MER 30 – 417 MER 31 – 389			MER 30 – 417 MER 31 – 389	MER 30 - 806 MER 31 - 806					BT	The ad hoc report and Exhibit A is correct, the consolidation report is incorrect.
18	CEDAR CREEK TOWNSHIP PRECINCT 04	Consolidation Report	Omitted from the consolidation report but conflicts with Lake County's reasoning since there are less than 600 active voters and should have been included in the consolidation report. Additionally, the # in column N is the # of active voters which should be listed.										39dn	562
19	CEDAR LAKE PRECINCT 08	Consolidation Report	Omitted from the consolidation report but conflicts with Lake County's reasoning since there are less than 600 active voters and should have been included in the consolidation report. Additionally, the # in column N is the # of active voters which should be listed.										39dn	75
20	CEDAR LAKE PRECINCT 09	Consolidation Report	Omitted from the consolidation report but conflicts with Lake County's reasoning since there are less than 600 active voters and should have been included in the consolidation report. Additionally, the # in column N is the # of active voters which should be listed.										39dn	4
21	CEDAR LAKE PRECINCT 10	Consolidation Report	Omitted from the consolidation report but conflicts with Lake County's reasoning since there are less than 600 active voters and should have been included in the consolidation report. Additionally, the # in column N is the # of active voters which should be listed.										39dn	0

Attachment H: Report Discrepancy Log

7/31/2018

76	ST JOHN TOWNSHIP PRECINCT 04	Consolidation Report	Omitted from the consolidation report but conflicts with Lake County's reasoning since there are less than 600 active voters and should have been included in the consolidation report. Additionally, the # in column N is the # of active voters which should be listed.									39dn	529
77	ST JOHN TOWNSHIP PRECINCT 05	Consolidation Report	Omitted from the consolidation report but conflicts with Lake County's reasoning since there are less than 600 active voters and should have been included in the consolidation report. Additionally, the # in column N is the # of active voters which should be listed.									39dn	375
78	WEST CREEK TOWNSHIP PRECINCT 01A	Consolidation Report	Omitted from the consolidation report but conflicts with Lake County's reasoning since there are less than 600 active voters and should have been included in the consolidation report. Additionally, the # in column N is the # of active voters which should be listed.									39dn	146
79	WINFIELD TOWNSHIP PRECINCT 03	Consolidation Report	Omitted from the consolidation report but conflicts with Lake County's reasoning since there are less than 600 active voters and should have been included in the consolidation report. Additionally, the # in column N is the # of active voters which should be listed.									39dn	512